An Integer Programming Approach to UEP Coding for Multiuser Broadcast Channels

Wook Jung

The Volgenau School of Engineering
George Mason University, Fairfax, VA. 22030
Email: wjung@gmu.edu

Shih-Chun Chang

Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
George Mason University, Fairfax, VA. 22030
Email: schang@gmu.edu

arXiv:1401.5321v1 [cs.IT] 21 Jan 2014

***Abstract*—In this paper, an integer programming approach is introduced to construct Unequal Error Protection (UEP) codes for multiuser broadcast channels. We show that the optimal codes can be constructed that satisfy the integer programming bound. Based on the bound, we compute asymptotic code rate and perform throughput analysis for the degraded broadcast channel.**

I. Introduction

In this paper, we present an integer programming approach to construct unequal error protection (UEP) codes for multiuser broadcast channels. Information theoretic features of the broadcast channel have been studied in [1], [2], [3] and the designs of UEP codes have been well investigated in [4], [5], [6], [7], [8], [9]. The UEP coding scheme corrects unequal channel errors and recovers messages for all users effectively over the broadcast communication system.

The multiuser broadcast communication system is depicted in Fig. 1. Due to the unequal error characteristics of the broadcast channel, each receiver may have different level of error protection requirement denoted by

$$\mathbf{t} = (t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_k) \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \le i \le k \tag{1}$$

where t_i is the error protection requirement for a receiver i.

Let C be a (n, k) UEP code with a generator matrix $\mathbf{G}$;

$$C = \{\mathbf{mG} \mid m_i \in \{0,1\}, \quad 1 \le i \le k\}.$$

Then a separation vector $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_k)$ of the UEP code C is defined in [5] as follows

$$s_i = \min\{w_H(\mathbf{mG}) \mid m_i = 1\}, \quad 1 \le i \le k \tag{2}$$

where $w_H(\cdot)$ denotes the Hamming weight. Given

$$s_i \ge 2t_i + 1 \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \le i \le k, \tag{3}$$

the receiver i can correct up to t_i errors and can recover the message $\hat{m}_i$. Given a specific separation vector, we design UPE codes that satisfy (2) based on an integer programming approach.

In the following sections, we introduce an integer programming model to construct UEP codes and derive the performance bounds to show the efficiency of the codes. Based on the integer programming bound, we compute asymptotic code rate and perform throughput analysis for the degraded broadcast channel.



Fig. 1. Broadcast communication system

II. UEP codes for broadcast channels

In [4], Masnick and Wolf have presented a UEP code construction method. However, it has been claimed by the authors that the optimal code construction beyond $k = 5$ is extremely difficult. It motivates us to develop an innovative approach based on integer programming to construct optimal UEP codes beyond $k = 5$.

A. Integer programming approach

We begin our approach by specifying the separation vector $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_k)$ satisfies,

$$s_i \le s_j \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \le i < j \le k. \tag{4}$$

Let $\mathbf{A}_a$ be a $k \times (2^k - 1)$ matrix consisting of all nonzero binary k-tuples as columns in increasing order.

$$\mathbf{A}_a = \begin{pmatrix} 0\,0\,0\cdots 0\,1\cdots 1\,1 \\ 0\,0\,0\cdots 1\,0\cdots 1\,1 \\ \vdots\,\vdots\,\vdots\,\ddots\,\vdots\,\vdots\,\ddots\,\vdots\,\vdots \\ 0\,1\,1\cdots 1\,0\cdots 1\,1 \\ 1\,0\,1\cdots 1\,0\cdots 0\,1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a}_1 \\ \mathbf{a}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{a}_{k-1} \\ \mathbf{a}_k \end{pmatrix} \tag{5}$$

where $\mathbf{a}_i = \left(a_{i,1}, a_{i,2}, \ldots, a_{i,2^k-1}\right)$ is a row vector. Let $\mathbf{G}$ be a generator matrix of UEP code written as

$$\mathbf{G} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{g}_1 \\ \mathbf{g}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{g}_k \end{pmatrix}, \tag{6}$$

then each $\mathbf{g}_i$ for $1 \le i \le k$ can be represented as

$$\mathbf{g}_i = \Big(\underbrace{a_{i,1}, \ldots, a_{i,1}}_{x_1}, \underbrace{a_{i,2}, \ldots, a_{i,2}}_{x_2}, \cdots, \underbrace{a_{i,2^k-1}, \ldots, a_{i,2^k-1}}_{x_{2^k-1}}\Big) \tag{7}$$

where $\sum_{j=1}^{2^k-1} x_i$ is the code length n.

It follows from (2) that, for a given non-decreasing separation vector $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_k)$,

$$w_H(\mathbf{g}_1) \ge s_1, \tag{8a}$$

$$w_H\Big(\mathbf{g}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} m_j \mathbf{g}_j\Big) \ge s_i \qquad \text{for} \quad 2 \le i \le k \tag{8b}$$

where $m_j \in \{0, 1\}$. From (7),

$$w_H(\mathbf{g}_i) = \sum_{j=1}^{2^k-1} a_{i,j} x_j = \mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{x}^\top \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \le i \le k \tag{9}$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{2^k-1})$. Consequently,

$$w_H\Big(\mathbf{g}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} m_j \mathbf{g}_j\Big) = \left(\mathbf{a}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} m_j \mathbf{a}_j\right) \mathbf{x}^\top. \tag{10}$$

From (8), (9), and (10), let $\mathbf{A}_i$ contains all 2^{i-1} rows of

$$\mathbf{a}_i \qquad \text{for} \quad i = 1 \tag{11a}$$

$$\mathbf{a}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} m_j \mathbf{a}_j \qquad \text{for} \quad 2 \le i \le k, \tag{11b}$$

then, we have the following inequalities

$$\mathbf{A}_i \mathbf{x}^\top \ge \mathbf{b}_i^\top \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \le i \le k \tag{12}$$

where $\mathbf{A}_i$ is a $2^{i-1} \times (2^k - 1)$ matrix and $\mathbf{b}_i = (s_i, s_i, \ldots, s_i)$ is a row vector of length 2^{i-1}. Based on (12), we can formulate UEP code construction for a given non-decreasing separation vector $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_k)$ as an integer programming model.

UEP code construction with integer programming

Minimize $\quad n_{\mathbf{s}} = x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_{2^k-1}$

subject to

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^\top \ge \mathbf{b}^\top$$

where

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{A}_1 \\ \mathbf{A}_2 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{A}_k \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{b}^\top = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{b}_1^\top \\ \mathbf{b}_2^\top \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{b}_k^\top \end{pmatrix}$$

***Example** 1:* For $k = 3$ and $\mathbf{s} = (3, 5, 7)$,

$$\mathbf{A}_a = \begin{pmatrix} 0001111 \\ 0110011 \\ 1010101 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a}_1 \\ \mathbf{a}_2 \\ \mathbf{a}_3 \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$\mathbf{G} = \underbrace{\left(\begin{array}{c|cc|c|ccc} 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 1 & \cdots \\ 1 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots \end{array}\right.}_{\leftarrow x_1 \rightarrow} \underbrace{\left.\begin{array}{ccc} 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & \cdots & 1 \end{array}\right)}_{\leftarrow x_7 \rightarrow} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{g}_1 \\ \mathbf{g}_2 \\ \mathbf{g}_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then,

$$\mathbf{A}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0001111 \end{pmatrix} = (\mathbf{a}_1),$$

$$\mathbf{A}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0110011 \\ 0111100 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a}_2 \\ \mathbf{a}_2 + \mathbf{a}_1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$\mathbf{A}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1010101 \\ 1011010 \\ 1100110 \\ 1101001 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{a}_3 \\ \mathbf{a}_3 + \mathbf{a}_1 \\ \mathbf{a}_3 + \mathbf{a}_2 \\ \mathbf{a}_3 + \mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{a}_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, the UEP code construction is to find $\mathbf{x}$ that minimizes the sum $x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_7$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} x_4 + x_5 + x_6 + x_7 &\ge 3 \\ x_2 + x_3 + x_6 + x_7 &\ge 5 \\ x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 &\ge 5 \\ x_1 + x_3 + x_5 + x_7 &\ge 7 \\ x_1 + x_3 + x_4 + x_6 &\ge 7 \\ x_1 + x_2 + x_5 + x_6 &\ge 7 \\ x_1 + x_2 + x_4 + x_7 &\ge 7. \end{aligned}$$

The optimal solution for this example shall be given in later section.

B. Integer programming bound

In [7], van Gils has derived a lower bound of a UEP code for a non-increasing separation vector $\mathbf{s}' = (s'_1, s'_2, \ldots, s'_k)$ as

$$n_{\mathbf{s}'} \ge \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left\lceil \frac{s'_i}{2^{i-1}} \right\rceil. \tag{13}$$

We begin by introducing the bound of (13) for a purpose to give the following theorem.

***Theorem** 1 (Integer programming bound):* For a given k, let $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_k)$ be a non-decreasing separation vector, then the integer programming bound is given by

$$n_{\mathbf{s}} \ge \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left\lceil \frac{s_i}{2^{k-i}} \right\rceil. \tag{14}$$

Proof: For the integer programming problem, we formulate $2^k - 1$ inequalities in matrix form as

$$\mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}^\top \ge \mathbf{b}^\top.$$

Since the rows of $\mathbf{A}$ consist of 2^k-1 linear combinations of $\mathbf{a}_i$ for $1 \le i \le k$, each column of $\mathbf{A}$ has 2^{k-1} ones [10, p.97]. Therefore, the sum of 2^k-1 inequalities is

$$2^{k-1}\left(x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_{2^k-1}\right) \ge \sum_{i=1}^{k} 2^{i-1} s_i,$$

hence,

$$n_{\mathbf{s}} \;\ge\; \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{s_i}{2^{k-i}}. \tag{15}$$

Since the separation vector $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_k)$ is in non-decreasing order, set $s'_i = s_{k-i+1}$ and then, transform the bound of (13) into

$$n_{\mathbf{s}'} \ge \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left\lceil \frac{s'_i}{2^{i-1}} \right\rceil = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left\lceil \frac{s_{k-i+1}}{2^{i-1}} \right\rceil = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left\lceil \frac{s_i}{2^{k-i}} \right\rceil. \tag{16}$$

For every i from 1 to k,

$$\left\lceil \frac{s_i}{2^{k-i}} \right\rceil \;\ge\; \frac{s_i}{2^{k-i}}. \tag{17}$$

Therefore, the actual lower bound of the integer programming is exactly the same as the bound of (16). Consequently

$$n_{\mathbf{s}} \;\ge\; \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left\lceil \frac{s_i}{2^{k-i}} \right\rceil.$$

■

In the following, we also include an upper bound on the length $n_{\mathbf{s}}$ derived by Masnick and Wolf in [4],

$$n_{\mathbf{s}} \le k + r_U \tag{18}$$

and r_U is the smallest number of check bits r such that $2^r > \gamma$ where

$$\gamma = \sum_{i=0}^{2t_k-1} \binom{n-1}{i} - \sum_{i=2}^{k} \binom{n-1-T_i}{2t_i-2} - \sum_{i=2}^{k} \binom{n-1-T_i}{2t_i-1} \tag{19}$$

and T_i is the number of message bits that are protected against i-bit or more errors. Numerical results for the lower and upper bounds are shown in Table I.

C. Integer programming results

In Table I, we present the numerical results of integer programming by using IBM ILOG CPLEX v12.5.1 [11] for $\mathbf{s} = (3, 5, \ldots, 2k+1)$. From $k = 2$ to 8, $n_{\mathbf{s}}$ are exactly the same as the lower bound, therefore the corresponding UEP codes are optimal. The optimal results are listed in Table II. For $9 \le k \le 15$, instead of finding optimal solutions, we limit our search for sub-optimal solutions due to time constraint. The results and both lower and upper bounds are plotted in Fig. 2.

***Example** 2:* The optimal solution obtained from the integer programming for $\mathbf{s} = (3, 5, 7)$ is

$$n_{\mathbf{s}} = \sum_{i=1}^{7} x_i = 11,$$

TABLE I
NUMERICAL RESULTS FOR $\mathbf{s} = (3, 5, \ldots, 2k+1)$

k	Lower bounds (14)	Integer programming results, $n_{\mathbf{s}}$	Upper bounds (18)
2	7	7	7
3	11	11	12
4	16	16	19
5	20	20	25
6	25	25	32
7	30	30	39
8	35	35	46
9	39	⟨40⟩	53
10	44	⟨45⟩	60
11	49	⟨52⟩	67
12	55	⟨58⟩	74
13	59	⟨64⟩	81
14	64	⟨70⟩	88
15	69	⟨76⟩	95

Note: $\langle\cdot\rangle$ indicates sub-optimal length.



Fig. 2. Integer programming results with bounds.

and one of the optimal solutions occurs at

$$\begin{array}{c|ccccccc} x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & x_4 & x_5 & x_6 & x_7 \\ \hline 3 & 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{array}.$$

It means that i-th column of $\mathbf{A}_a$ appears x_i times in the optimal generator matrix. Therefore,

$$\mathbf{G} = \begin{pmatrix} 0\,0\,0\,0\,0\,0\,0\,1\,1\,1\,1 \\ 0\,0\,0\,1\,1\,1\,1\,0\,0\,1\,1 \\ 1\,1\,1\,0\,0\,1\,1\,0\,1\,0\,1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $\hat{\mathbf{s}} = (\hat{s}_1, \hat{s}_2, \ldots, \hat{s}_k)$ denote the separation vector obtained from the corresponding $\mathbf{G}$. If

$$\hat{s}_i \ge s_i \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \le i \le k,$$

then $\mathbf{G}$ satisfies (2). In this example,

$$\hat{\mathbf{s}} = (4, 6, 7) \quad \ge \quad \mathbf{s} = (3, 5, 7).$$

There are many combinations of x_i for $1 \le i \le 2^k - 1$ that are summed to the optimal value of $n_{\mathbf{s}}$ (e.g., there are 3 solutions of x_i to $n_{\mathbf{s}} = 7$ when $k = 2$, 7 solutions of x_i to

TABLE II
OPTIMAL RESULTS OF INTEGER PROGRAMMING

k	$n_{\mathbf{s}}$	non-zero x_i for $1 \le i \le 2^k-1$	$\hat{\mathbf{s}}$
2	7	$\underset{4\ 2\ 1}{x_1x_2x_3}$	$(3,5)$
3	11	$\underset{3\ 2\ 2\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1}{x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5x_6x_7}$	$(4,6,7)$
4	16	$\underset{2\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1}{x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5x_6x_7x_8x_9x_{10}x_{11}x_{12}x_{13}x_{14}x_{15}}$	$(8,8,8,9)$
5	20	$\underset{2\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1}{x_1x_2x_3x_4x_5x_6x_7x_8x_9x_{10}x_{11}x_{12}x_{13}x_{14}x_{15}x_{16}x_{17}x_{18}x_{19}}$	$(4,8,8,10,11)$
6	25	$\underset{1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1}{x_1\ x_2\ x_3\ x_4\ x_5\ x_6x_7x_8x_9x_{10}x_{11}x_{12}x_{13}x_{14}x_{15}x_{16}x_{17}x_{18}x_{19}x_{20}}$ $\underset{1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1}{x_{21}x_{32}x_{33}x_{34}x_{35}}$	$(4,6,8,10,12,13)$
7	30	$\underset{1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1}{x_1\ x_2\ x_3\ x_4\ x_5\ x_6\ x_7\ x_8\ x_9\ x_{10}\ x_{11}x_{12}x_{13}x_{14}x_{15}x_{16}x_{17}x_{18}x_{19}x_{20}}$ $\underset{1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1}{x_{21}x_{22}x_{23}x_{32}x_{33}x_{34}x_{35}x_{64}x_{65}x_{104}}$	$(3,5,8,9,12,14,15)$
8	35	$\underset{1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1}{x_1\ x_2\ x_3\ x_4\ x_5\ x_6\ x_7\ x_8\ x_9\ x_{10}\ x_{11}\ x_{12}\ x_{13}\ x_{14}\ x_{15}\ x_{16}x_{17}x_{18}x_{19}x_{20}}$ $\underset{1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1\ 1}{x_{21}x_{22}x_{23}x_{32}x_{33}x_{34}x_{35}x_{64}x_{65}x_{66}x_{126}x_{127}x_{128}x_{129}x_{184}}$	$(3,5,7,11,11,13,15,17)$

$n_{\mathbf{s}} = 11$ when $k = 3$, 2063 solutions of x_i to $n_{\mathbf{s}} = 16$ when $k = 4$, and so on).

D. Asymptotic code rates

For $\mathbf{s} = (3, 5, \ldots, 2k+1)$, we present the corresponding asymptotic code rates based on the lower bounds as follows.

***Theorem** 2:* Let R_{UEP} be the rate of UEP code whose separation vector is $\mathbf{s} = (3, 5, \ldots, 2k+1)$. Then

$$R_{\mathsf{UEP}} \approx 0.2 \quad \text{when} \quad k \gg 1. \tag{20}$$

Proof: Let $n_{\mathbf{s}}$ satisfy the bound of (14), then

$$n_{\mathbf{s}} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left\lceil \frac{2i+1}{2^{k-i}} \right\rceil = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \left\lceil \frac{2(k-j)+1}{2^j} \right\rceil. \tag{21}$$

Let $\eta_j \triangleq \lceil (2k-2j+1)/2^j \rceil$ and $k = a_x 2^x + a_{x-1}2^{x-1} + \cdots + a_0$ where $x = \lfloor \log_2 k \rfloor$, then

$$\eta_j = \begin{cases} 2k+1 & , \ j = 0 \\ k & , \ j = 1 \\ a_x 2^{x-j+1} + \cdots + a_{j-1}2^0 + \delta_j & , 2 \le j \le x+1 \\ 1 & , \ x+2 \le j \le k-1 \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

where $\delta_j \in \{0, 1\}$ [12, p.47,51].

Let $\Delta_j \triangleq \eta_j - \delta_j$ for $2 \le j \le x+1$, then

$$\Delta_j = a_x 2^{x-j+1} + a_{x-1}2^{x-j} + \cdots + a_{j-1}2^0, \tag{23}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=2}^{x+1} \Delta_j &= a_x \left(2^{x-1} + \cdots + 1\right) + a_{x-1}\left(2^{x-2} + \cdots + 1\right) \\ &\quad + \cdots + a_2 (2+1) + a_1 \\ &= a_x \left(2^x - 1\right) + a_{x-1}\left(2^{x-1} - 1\right) + \cdots + a_0 (1-1) \\ &= k - \sum_{i=0}^{x} a_i \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{1} \eta_j = 3k+1, \tag{25a}$$

$$\sum_{j=2}^{x+1} \eta_j = k - \sum_{i=0}^{x} a_i + \sum_{j=2}^{x+1} \delta_j, \tag{25b}$$

and

$$\sum_{j=x+2}^{k-1} \eta_j = k - \lfloor \log_2 k \rfloor - 2. \tag{25c}$$

Consequently,

$$n_{\mathbf{s}} \ = \ \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \eta_j \ \approx \ 5k \quad \text{when} \quad k \gg 1. \tag{26}$$

Therefore the code rate is converged to $R_{\mathsf{UEP}} \approx \frac{k}{5k} = 0.2$. ■

The actual rates of UEP codes based on $R = \frac{k}{n_{\mathbf{s}}}$ are illustrated in Fig. 3 for $k \le 2^{15}$, which shows asymptotic convergence to 0.2 as proven in Theorem 2.



Fig. 3. UEP code rates for $2 \leq k \leq 2^{15}$.

E. Throughput of degraded broadcast channels

The proposed broadcast channel model can be considered as a degraded broadcast channel that has k component channels [3]. Let S be a source input and T_i be outputs of the component channels where $S, T_i \in \{0, 1\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, then the error characteristics of the channel can be described with k cascaded binary symmetric channels (BSCs) with parameters $\alpha_i \in [0, 1]$ as shown in Fig. 4.

Let p_i denote the bit error probability of the each component channel, then

$$p_i = p_{i-1}(1 - \alpha_i) + (1 - p_{i-1})\alpha_i, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k \tag{27}$$

where $p_0 = 0$ [3]. Let $n_{\mathbf{s}}$ satisfy the bound in (14) for a given separation vector $\mathbf{s} = (3, 5, \ldots, 2k + 1)$, then m_i can be successfully delivered to receiver i when the corresponding component channel introduces less than or equal to i errors. Therefore the average rate of successful transmission of a bit to receiver i, denoting by θ_i, can be given as

$$\theta_i = \sum_{j=0}^{i} \binom{n_{\mathbf{s}}}{j} (1 - p_i)^{n_{\mathbf{s}} - j} p_i^j, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k, \tag{28}$$

consequently,

$$R_i = \frac{\theta_i}{n_{\mathbf{s}}}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq k \tag{29}$$

where R_i denote the effective transmission rate of each component channel. Let R_T be the throughput of the broadcast channel, then

$$R_T = \sum_{i=1}^{k} R_i \ \leq \ \frac{k}{n_{\mathbf{s}}}. \tag{30}$$

The numerical results of the throughput R_T, in comparison to the corresponding code rate $\frac{k}{n_{\mathbf{s}}}$, for $2 \leq k \leq 2^7$ are illustrated in Fig. 5 when $\alpha_i = 1/n_{\mathbf{s}}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$.

III. Conclusion

In this paper, we have proposed an integer programming approach to UEP coding for multiuser broadcast channels. We have constructed optimal UEP codes by using an integer programming model. Based on the integer programming bound,



Fig. 4. Cascaded BSCs for degraded broadcast channel [3].



Fig. 5. Code rate and throughput of the degraded broadcast channel for $2 \leq k \leq 2^7$.

we have demonstrated the achievable asymptotic code rates in comparison to the throughput of the degraded broadcast channel.

Even though we limit to send 1 bit to each receiver, the integer programming approach can be extended to send a multi-bit message or a packet to each receiver, we refer this to UEP network coding in a follow-up paper.

References

[1] T. M. Cover, "Broadcast channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 2–14, Jan. 1972.

[2] ——, "Comments on broadcast channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 2524–2530, Oct. 1998.

[3] P. Bergmans, "Random coding theorem for broadcast channels with degraded components," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 197–207, Mar. 1973.

[4] B. Masnick and J. Wolf, "On linear unequal error protection codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 600–607, Oct. 1967.

[5] L. A. Dunning and W. E. Robbins, "Optimal encodings of linear block codes for unequal error protection," *Inform. Control*, vol. 37, pp. 150–177, May 1978.

[6] I. Boyarinov and G. Katsman, "Linear unequal error protection codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 168–175, Mar. 1981.

[7] W. J. van Gils, "Two topics on linear unequal error protection codes: Bounds on their length and cyclic code classes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 866–876, 1983.

[8] ——, "Linear unequal error protection codes from shorter codes (corresp.)," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 544–546, May 1984.

[9] M.-C. Lin and S. Lin, "Codes with multi-level error-correcting capabilities," *Discrete Mathematics*, vol. 83, no. 23, pp. 301–314, 1990.

[10] S. Lin and D. J. Costello, *Error control coding*, 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2004.

[11] *User's manual for CPLEX V12.5.1*, IBM ILOG, 2013. [Online]. Available: http://pic.dhe.ibm.com/infocenter/cosinfoc/v12r5/index.jsp

[12] D. E. Knuth, *The art of computer programming*, 3rd ed. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1997, vol. 1.